



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

abolitionists were opposed to the constitution and the Union. Chapter XI, entitled "Seventy Years of Dis-union," is a defense of secession, in which the author, beginning with the colonial period, traces the growth of centralization and cites abundant evidence to show that the fathers held the view that the Union was composed of sovereign States and that the constitution was a compact under which each State reserved its sovereign rights. The Virginia and the Kentucky resolutions, the New England conspiracy of 1803-4, Burr's conspiracy, the Hartford convention, Georgia's defiance of the Federal government, and other less important instances of like character are discussed to prove that secession and nullification were contemplated by many persons and sections before the Southerners made the final attempt following Lincoln's election. The thirteenth chapter deals with the "South's handicaps in the war" and shows that one of these was Stephens himself. His opposition to Davis' policies grew as the war went on and was the outgrowth of his constitutional opposition to the centralization of power in Davis' hands, and to what Stephens believed to be unwise and illegal action of the government in carrying out its war policy. Mr. Pendleton has made an endeavor to throw new light on Stephens' character by a search in the contemporary newspapers of Georgia, but no important information has been discovered.

On the whole the publishers have a certain justification in reprinting the most important parts of the earlier lives of Stephens which are now out of print, but it would have been better to have called this volume a reprint or condensation with notes by Mr. Pendleton. In any other guise the book is sailing under false colors. The bibliography appended is worthless.

—EDWARD McMAHON.

---

**Stephen A. Douglas: A Study in American Politics.** By Allen Johnson. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908, pp. 503.)

When Stephen A. Douglas died in Chicago forty-seven years ago the Chicago Tribune said editorially, "That the place which the departed statesman occupied in the National Councils can not, in any true sense, be filled, all will agree." Four days later in an estimate of him the same paper said, "No man has died in many a decade whose death will be so widely felt as that of him whose body was yesterday borne through our streets. \* \* \* He was the Democratic party of the North. \* \* \* His under-

takers should have buried his mantle with him—there is no one to wear it.” This is certainly a remarkable tribute when one remembers that it came from the pen of Douglas’ ablest editorial opponent.

Yet, in spite of the high regard in which Douglas was held by the friends and foes of his day, it has required nearly a half century to raise up a competent historical scholar to do justice to his memory. His great opponent, Lincoln, the only man who ever overcame Douglas in debate or politics, has so completely overshadowed him that we are tempted to forget there ever was such a man as Douglas much less remember that it required the best efforts of the greatest man America has produced to vanquish him.

But, there is abundant compensation in waiting for Prof. Johnson’s book for he has done an admirable piece of work. An equally competent scholar could have done it years ago, however, for Prof. Johnson has unearthed no material of importance that has not long been known. Douglas left practically nothing of value in the form of manuscripts except an autobiographical sketch of his early years, and a collection of letters to his friends and political lieutenant, Chas. H. Lanphier, editor of the Illinois State Register. The great bulk of the material concerning him is, so far as discovered, in the well known printed sources.

Prof. Johnson has made excellent use of this material, and is peculiarly fitted to interpret Douglas’ career. Like Douglas he was born in New England and later came in touch with the virgin democracy of the Middle West which has enabled him admirably “to interpret the spirit of that region which gave both Douglas and Lincoln to the nation.” Interpretation is the strongest feature of the book. No new facts of importance are revealed but the known facts are handled so well that we are no longer at a loss for a just and adequate understanding of the aims and ambitions of the great Northern Democrat “whose life spans the controversial period before the Civil War.”

The volume is divided into three parts. The first, entitled “The Call of the West,” carries the narrative through 142 pages to the acquisition of the Mexican Cession. The second part of 164 pages deals with the measures of adjustment growing out of the Mexican Cession, and the introduction and passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, and closes with the testing of popular sovereignty in Kansas. The last part continues the narrative from the revolt of Douglas, through the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the

campaign of 1860, and the beginning of Civil War, to the death of Douglas on June 3, 1861.

No detailed examination of Prof. Johnson's pages can be presented here. It is sufficient to say that he has avoided all attempts at vindication of Douglas' views or policies. He holds a brief for no man or party but has conscientiously aimed to present the situation as it appeared to Douglas and his contemporaries. The book is abundantly supplied with foot-notes, is well printed, neatly bound and adequately indexed. It will take front rank with the best products of modern historical scholarship.

—EDWARD McMAHON.